

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 10 and 13 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 amended, and claims 16 and 17 are added. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 8, and 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 to recite, "the reflective pixel electrodes are formed in respective first substantially rectangular regions closely arranged side-by-side ... and the control elements are formed in respective second substantially rectangular regions closely arranged side-by-side" Because claims 2-5, 11, 12, 14 and 15 directly or indirectly depend from claims 1 or 8 and claims 10 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 6-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,950,058 to Diem et al. ("Diem") in view of U.S. Patent 4,519,678 to Komatsubara et al. ("Komatsubara"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Diem and Komatsubara, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest "an array of control elements arranged in rows and columns formed on the semiconductor substrate, the array of control elements including row drive lines and column drive lines formed on the semiconductor substrate," as recited in claim 6, from which claim 7 directly depends.

Diem and Komatsubara, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest "forming an array of control elements arranged in rows and columns on a semiconductor substrate, the array of control elements including row drive lines and column drive lines formed on the semiconductor substrate," as recited in claim 9.

Diem discloses placing line conductors (corresponding to the row drive lines) on one substrate, and column conductor lines (corresponding to the column drive lines) on another substrate. Specifically, as shown in Figure 4 and disclosed in Col. 3, lines 32-52 of Diem, elements 20, each including a thin film transistor and an electrode, are arranged on a first surface. The bases of the transistors are connected to line conductors L_i , and collectors of the transistors are connected to a reference potential V_{ref} . As shown in Figure 5 and disclosed in Col. 3, lines 53-61, electrodes corresponding to the colors red, green, or blue are arranged on a second surface. The electrodes are connected by column conductors C_j . A liquid crystal is interposed between these first and second surfaces. As shown in Figure 6, the voltage V_{L_i} and $V_{L_{i+1}}$ are applied to the line conductors L_i and L_{i+1} , and the voltage V_{C_j} is applied to a column conductor C_j to energize the elemental image points corresponding to the crossings of the line conductors and of the column conductor. Thus, the arrangement of the transistors and electrodes on the first surface shown in Figure 4 is only operative in combination with the arrangement of electrodes and column conductors on the second surface.

If the arrangement of transistors and electrodes in Figure 4 of Diem are utilized in the display device of Komatsubara, this would require arranging the column conductors on the second surface, i.e., on the transparent substrate 6 of Komatsubara. Accordingly, the combination of Diem and Komatsubara do not provide an "array of control elements including row drive lines and column drive lines formed on the semiconductor substrate," as recited in claims 6 and 9.

Claims 2, 5 and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,757,444 to Takamura in view of Komatsubara.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Office Action indicates that claims 1, 3, and 4 contain allowable features. Because the Office Action did not reject claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103, the Office Action concedes that claim 8 also contains allowable features.

Applicants have amended claims 2, 11, and 12 to depend from claim 1. Claim 5 also depends from claim 1. In addition, Applicants have amended claims 14 and 15 to depend from claim 8. Further, Applicants have cancelled claims 10 and 13 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 5 and 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Takamura in view of Komatsubara is respectfully requested.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 6, 8, and 9 are distinguishable over the applied art. The remainder of the claims that depend from independent claims 1, 6, 8, and 9 are likewise distinguishable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

III. Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Paul F. Daebeler
Registration No. 35,852

JAO:PFD/can

Date: March 8, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--